### 1

#### First, interpretation- restrictions on energy production are limited to direct legal prohibitions or limits on the ability to produce

#### A-Restrictions are policy instruments—either statutory or regulatory—that directly limit activity

Free Legal Dictionary, accessed 12

[http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/restriction //wyo-tjc]

restriction n. any limitation on activity, by statute, regulation or contract provision. In multi-unit real estate developments, condominium and cooperative housing projects, managed by homeowners' associations or similar organizations are usually required by state law to impose restrictions on use. Thus, the restrictions are part of the "covenants, conditions and restrictions," intended to enhance the use of common facilities and property, recorded and incorporated into the title of each owner.

#### B-‘On’ refers to the indicated destination or focus of an effort

Merriam Webster, no date

[http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/on]

9a —used as a function word to indicate destination or the focus of some action, movement, or directed effort <crept up on him> <feast your eyes on this> <working on my skiing> <made a payment on the loan> b —used as a function word to indicate the focus of feelings, determination, or will <have pity on me> <keen on sports> <a curse on you> c —used as a function word to indicate the object with respect to some misfortune or disadvantageous event <the crops died on them> d —used as a function word to indicate the subject of study, discussion, or consideration <a book on insects> <reflect on that a moment> <agree on price> e : with respect to <go light on the salt> <short on cash>

#### Second, violation: The affirmative does not remove a legal barrier on civilian production; the lack of LEU is a practical barrier.

#### Third, Reasons to prefer:

#### A-Principled limit- restriction isn’t a term of art in energy literature and it is commonly used in context. Direct legal barriers is the only way to place a limit on what counts

#### B- Education- expansive definitions creates an opportunity cost with learning about the ins and outs of the barriers within the leasing system because a larger topic trades off with in depth case research and results in more generics

#### Fourth, vote negative: Topicality is a voting issue because it is a prima facie burden and should be evaluated as a question of competing interpretations

### 2

#### Obama is winning the election now, but it’s close

Montanaro 10-29

(Domenico Montanaro, writer for MSNBC. “Romney, Obama camps spar over who's really winning” 10-29-12 http://firstread.nbcnews.com/\_news/2012/10/29/14783817-romney-obama-camps-spar-over-whos-really-winning?lite//wyoccd)

The latest is over whether Republican challenger Mitt Romney is making up so much ground on President Barack Obama that he is expanding the map into places like Pennsylvania and even Minnesota – or whether Romney’s path is so limited that he needs to find new states to put in play. Recommended: Sandy gives unpredictable twist to 2012 election There is some evidence for the expansion and tightened battleground landscape. There is a new poll today, for example, from the University of Cincinnati showing Romney closing the gap in Ohio to a tied race, 49 to 49 percent. Some polls in the Keystone State in recent weeks have showed Romney within 5 points, but the Romney campaign has not made a serious play for the state, booking no ads despite those public polls. A poll out today from the Philadelphia Inquirer shows Obama up 49 to 43 percent. That’s a slight improvement for Romney from earlier this month, when Obama was up 50 to 42 percent. The pro-Romney outside group Restore Our Future, however, is now giving it another shot in Pennsylvania, booking $2 million in ads for this week. The Obama campaign says it will respond with ads of its own, because it’s not “going to take anything for granted right now,” Campaign Manager Jim Messina said on a conference call with reporters, but the campaign categorically denies that it is seeing any momentum for Romney in its data. "I don't want to be ambiguous about this at all: We're winning this race,” Obama campaign adviser David Axelrod said on the call, “and I say that not on the basis of some mystical faith in a wave that's going to come...We base it on cold, hard data. … In just eight days, we'll know who was bluffing and who wasn't." Two polls in Minnesota show two different stories – one from Mason-Dixon showing a 4-point race, 47 to 43 percent with Obama leading; the other from St. Cloud University has it Obama 53 percent, Romney 45 percent, close to the president’s 2008 margin. The Obama campaign began running advertising in Minneapolis last week, which it said is intended for Wisconsin, but it is also dispatching former President Bill Clinton to Minnesota for two campaign events tomorrow.

#### Obama winning the working class white vote now, but Romney is close enough for vote switching

National Post 10-31

(“White Working-Class Voters Expanding Presidential Battleground Map” 10-31-12 http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/against-the-grain/white-working-class-voters-expanding-presidential-battleground-map-20121031//wyoccd)

That’s creating a scenario where the president faces a high bar to expand the minority share of electorate even further over 2008 to compensate. Indeed, one of the reasons polling tends to be most volatile in these states is that the makeup of the electorate will determine the winner. There aren’t a whole lot of persuadable voters here. Polls showing Romney ahead assume the electorate will be whiter and older; polls showing Obama leading tend to expect a more diverse electorate. The winner in these states will be which campaign is best able to turn out its base. Early vote tallies in all three states suggest that Democrats are coming close to hitting their turnout targets, but with GOP enthusiasm surging substantially versus a weak showing in 2008. Meanwhile, the Obama turnout machine isn’t quite as valuable in the more homogeneous battleground states--Iowa, Ohio, Wisconsin, and New Hampshire--that make up the president’s firewall. These states have older, whiter electorates. The name of the game for Democrats here is persuasion as much as mobilization. In Ohio, Obama’s campaign strategy is clear: making Romney’s opposition to the auto bailout a central part of the bid to hold onto enough working-class whites to win the state. But it’s also becoming clear that it’s not just Ohio, Iowa, and Wisconsin that are looking winnable for Romney--it’s the entire swath of competitive Midwestern and Rust Belt states that share demographic similarities, and where Republicans made significant gains during the 2010 midterms. Obama holds a small lead in Ohio thanks to the auto bailout, but the issues driving the electorate in neighboring states are more favorable to Republicans.

#### Blue collar, working class whites will decide the election due to their swing state locations- Obama will alienate them and send them to Romney should he reject traditional FF expansion

Mead 2012

[Walter Russell Mead, James Clarke Chace Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College and Editor-at-Large of The American Interest magazine, and is recognized as one of the country's leading students of American foreign policy. June 6, 2012, <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/06/06/green-politics-hurting-obama-in-swing-states/>, Uwyo//amp]

Since the beginning of the recession, America’s “brown jobs” revolution has been one of the few bright spots in an otherwise shaky recovery. States like North Dakota and Texas have led the country in growth due to their strong energy sectors, and the discovery of vast quantities of shale gas in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Colorado are now providing new jobs. These states have more than shale gas in common: all of them are also on the short list of swing states that decide this year’s presidential election. Republicans are seizing the opportunity to make energy politics a centerpiece of their campaign. As the FT reports: “Blue-collar voters were never that sold on environmental issues, and if some Democrats come across as not keen on economic development, it could lose them support here in Ohio,” he said. Republicans, from Mitt Romney, the party’s presidential candidate, to the congressional leadership, have made Barack Obama’s alleged stifling of the energy industry a centrepiece of their campaigns this year. . . . Mr Romney has said he will approve the Keystone XL pipeline as soon as he wins office and curb the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency. Only time will tell whether this is a winning strategy, but there is reason to think it could work. As we’ve mentioned before, energy politics is an area where Obama is particularly vulnerable. His decision to nix the popular Keystone pipeline earlier this year signaled antipathy toward one of America’s strongest industries while doing nothing to help the environment; it was lambasted as a pointless blunder by observers on both sides of the aisle. Meanwhile, his pet projects in alternative energy have fallen flat, as debacles like Solyndra have received far more attention than the program’s few successes. This should be seriously worrying to the Obama campaign. Brown jobs may be unpopular in Obama’s white-collar, urban, coastal base, but it is blue collar voters in swing states that are likely to decide the election, and many of these voters stand to reap significant benefits from an expansion of America’s energy sector. From a political perspective, Obama has placed himself on the wrong side of this issue. It may come back to bite him come November.

**Romney election causes Iran strikes. Approach to Iran is the biggest contrast in Obama and Romney foreign policy – Obama will continue to push sanctions and negotiation while Romney will bow to Israeli desires to attack and pursue a bombastic foreign policy.**

**Daily KOs**, Editorial, “The Daily Kos, President Obama Versus Romney on Iran”, 4/16/**2012** <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/16/1083726/-President-Obama-versus-Romney-on-Iran>

To me, however **the biggest contrast is their approach to Iran.** Binyamin Netanyahu by all accounts is a hawk who is pushing the United States to bomb Iran and has been doing so for a long time. He appears to see no need for negotiation. Granted, he has a right to protect his nation if he believes that its under threat. However, **we all know how flawed the “intelligence” was for the Iraq war. And its important to let negotiations play out as far as possible before rushing to war, which would have many unintended consequences for years to come.** (See the Iraq war). Here’s the big difference. Here’s Netanyahu’s recent response to the ongoing P5+1 talks: http://news.yahoo.com/... Netanyahu -- whose government has not ruled out a preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities -- earlier said however that Tehran had simply bought itself some extra time to comply. "My initial impression is that Iran has been given a 'freebie'," Netanyahu said during talks with visiting US Senator Joe Lieberman, the premier's office reported. "It has got five weeks to continue enrichment without any limitation, any inhibition. I think Iran should take immediate steps to stop all enrichment, take out all enrichment material and dismantle the nuclear facility in Qom," he said. "I believe that the world's greatest practitioner of terrorism must not have the opportunity to develop atomic bombs," he said. Here’s President Obama’s response yesterday to Netanyahu (in a response to a journalist's question) at the press conference in Cartagena: But Obama refuted that statement, saying "**The notion that we've given something away or a freebie would indicate that Iran has gotten something." "In fact, they got the toughest sanctions that they're going to be facing coming up in a few months if they don't take advantage of those talks. I hope they do," Obama said. "The clock is ticking and I've been very clear to Iran and our negotiating partners that we're not going to have these talks just drag out in a stalling process**," Obama told reporters after an Americas summit in Colombia. "But so far at least we haven't given away anything -- other than the opportunity for us to negotiate," he said. **Obama in conjunction with world powers is negotiating with Iran, trying to prevent** a needless **war.** You can be sure that Mitt **Romney would bow to his buddy Netanyahu and attack Iran. He has previously said “We will not have an inch of difference between ourselves and Israel”.** As he also said in a debate, before making any decision regarding Israel, he will call his friend Bibi. **Bottom line, if** somehow **the American people elect Mitt Romney, expect more of the bombastic, Bush cowboy approach to foreign policy with a** more than likely **bombardment of Iran. If** the American people are not fooled by this charlatan and **they reelect Barack Obama, he will continue in his measured way to deal with the threats around the world, quietly, through the use of negotiation, and force if absolutely necessary, but only as a last resort, without bragging, and scaring the American people with needless terrorism alerts.**

#### That leads to a global nuclear holocaust which draws in Russia and China AND leads to the detonation of CBW’s

**Morgan 09**

[Dennis Ray Morgan, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies- South Korea, 10 July 2009, World on fire: two scenarios of the destruction of human civilization and possible extinction of the human race, Futures 41 (2009) 683–693, uwyo//amp]

**Given the present day predicament regarding Iran’s attempt to become a nuclear power, particular attention should be given to one of Moore’s scenarios depicting nuclear war that begins through an attack on Iran’s supposed nuclear facilities**. According to Seymour Hersh [12] **the nuclear option against Iran has, in fact, been discussed** by sources in the Pentagon as a viable option. As Hersh reports, **according to a former intelligence officer, the lack of ‘‘reliable intelligence leaves military planners, given the goal of totally destroying the sites, little choice but to consider the use of tactical nuclear weapons. ‘Every other option, in the view of the nuclear weaponeers, would leave a gap,’** the former senior intelligence official said. ‘Decisive is the key word of the Air Force’s planning. **It’s a tough decision. But we made it in Japan**.’’ [12].10 The official continues to explain **how White House and Pentagon officials are considering the nuclear option for Iran, ‘‘Nuclear planners go through extensive training** and learn the technical details of damage and fallout - we’re talking about mushroom clouds, radiation, mass casualties, and contamination over years. This is not an underground nuclear test, where all you see is the earth raised a little bit. **These politicians don’t have a clue, and whenever anybody tries to get it out – remove the nuclear option – they’re shouted down’’** [12]. Understandably, some members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not comfortable about consideration of the nuclear option in a first strike, and some officers have even discussed resigning. Hersh quotes the former intelligence officer as saying, ‘‘Late this winter, the Joint Chiefs of Staff sought to remove the nuclear option from the evolving war plans for Iran - without success. The White House said, ‘Why are you challenging this? The option came from you’’’ [12]. **This scenario has gained even more plausibility since a January 2007 Sunday Times report [13] of an Israeli intelligence leak that Israel was considering a strike against Iran, using low-yield bunker busting nukes to destroy Iran’s supposedly secret underground nuclear facilities. In Moore’s scenario, non-nuclear neighboring countries would then respond with conventional rockets and chemical, biological and radiological weapons. Israel then would retaliate with nuclear strikes on several countries, including a pre-emptive strike against Pakistan, who then retaliates with an attack not only on Israel but pre-emptively striking India as well. Israel then initiates the ‘‘Samson option’’ with attacks on other Muslim countries, Russia, and possibly the ‘‘anti-Semitic’’ cities of Europe. At that point, all-out nuclear war ensues as the U.S. retaliates with nuclear attacks on Russia and possibly on China** as well.11 Out of the four interrelated factors that could precipitate a nuclear strike and subsequent escalation into nuclear war, probably the accidental factor is one that deserves particular attention since its likelihood is much greater than commonly perceived. In an article, ‘‘20 Mishaps that Might Have Started a Nuclear War,’’ Phillips [14] cites the historical record to illustrate how an accident, misinterpretation,or false alarm could ignite a nuclear war. Most of these incidents occurred during a time of intense tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the Cuban Missile Crisis, but other mishaps occurred during other times, with the most recent one in 1995. Close inspection of each of these incidents reveals how likely it is that an ‘‘accident’’ or misinterpretation of phenomena or data (‘‘glitch’’) can lead to nuclear confrontation and war. In his overall analysis, Phillips writes: The probability of actual progression to nuclear war on any one of the occasions listed may have been small, due to planned ‘‘failsafe’’ features in the warning and launch systems, and to responsible action by those in the chain of command when the failsafe features had failed. However, the accumulation of small probabilities of disaster from a long sequence of risks adds up to serious danger. There is no way of telling what the actual level of risk was in these mishaps but if the chance of disaster in every one of the 20 incidents had been only 1 in 100, it is a mathematical fact that the chance of surviving all 20 would have been 82%, i.e. about the same as the chance of surviving a single pull of the trigger at Russian roulette played with a 6- shooter. With a similar series of mishaps on the Soviet side: another pull of the trigger. If the risk in some of the events had been as high as 1 in 10, then the chance of surviving just seven such events would have been less than 50:50. [14]12 **Aggression in the Middle East along with the willingness to use low-yield ‘‘bunker busting’’ nukes by the U.S. only increases the likelihood of nuclear war and catastrophe in the future. White House and Pentagon policy-makers are seriously considering the use of strategic nuclear weapons against Iran**. As Ryan McMaken explains, **someone at the Pentagon who had . . .not yet completed the transformation into a complete sociopath leaked the ‘Nuclear Posture Review’ which outlined plans for a nuclear ‘end game’ with Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Syria, none of which possess nuclear weapons. The report also outlined plans to let the missiles fly on Russia and China** as well, even though virtually everyone on the face of the Earth thought we had actually normalized relations with them. **It turns out, much to the surprise of the Chinese and the Russians, that they are still potential enemies in a nuclear holocaust.**

### 3

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should ban new uranium mining

#### The net benefit will be on case.

### Case

### Adv 2

#### Preventing extinction is the highest ethical priority – we should take action to prevent the Other from dying FIRST, only THEN can we consider questions of value to life

Paul Wapner, associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University, Winter 2003, Dissent, online: http://www.dissentmagazine.org/menutest/archives/2003/wi03/wapner.htm

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean-François Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment.

#### Governments have ethical obligations to promote the welfare of everyone – even if they win their ethics framework preventing our disad impact is still an ethical imperative

Tim Stelzig, Attorney Advisor in the Competition Policy Division of the FCC's Wireline Competition Bureau, former associate with Arnold & Porter in Washington, D.C., JD from the University of Pennsylvania Law School, March 1998, University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 146 U. Pa. L. Rev. 901, p. 959

Libertarians have argued that such a state violates deontological norms, that governmental intervention going beyond what is minimally necessary to preserve social order is not justified. Deontology does not require such a timid state and, moreover, finds desirable a state which promotes the general welfare to the fullest extent possible, even if in so doing it acts in ways deontologically objectionable for anyone other than one filling the government's unique role in society. More specifically, I argued that the government must consequentially justify its policy choices. The elegance of this particular rationale for the contours of permissible governmental action is that it remains a deontological justification at base. One of the worries of full-blown consequentialism is that it requires too much, that any putative right may be set aside if doing so would produce greater good. The justification offered here does not suffer that flaw. The distributive exemption does not permit that any one be sacrificed for the betterment of others; rather, it only permits a redistribution of inevitable harms, a diversion of an existing threatened harm to many such that it results in harm to fewer individuals. The result of this application of the distributive exemption is a government that fundamentally seeks to promote to the fullest extent possible the welfare of all; a government that respects the rights of its citizens; and a government that realizes that its own intervention can have consequences counterproductive to the state's fundamental goal of general welfare that should be avoided for that reason. Such a state is a worthy totem, and accords with our most cherished principles molded through centuries of grappling with difficult legal and moral issues. Deontological premises have justified a plausible and attractive version of the liberal state in which consequential justification predominates, but rights are not neglected. This conclusion should be both surprising and reassuring to the deontologist - surprising because deontology and consequentialism are typically understood to be in opposition, and reassuring because most people's intuitions that the state is permitted to reason consequentially are firmly entrenched. To the degree that deontology could not account for these intuitions, deontology would be that much less credible.

#### Genocide can never be prevented because it can’t be proven to be avoided. Their studies divert attention from actual genocides

Journal of Genocide Research, 2005

 Volume 7, Issue 3 September From the Editor: can genocide be prevented? No! Yes? Perhaps http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a723853705&fulltext=713240928 pages 307 - 308

**One fundamental problem with genocide prevention is that it cannot be tested and results definitively proved. It can only be hypothetically asserted that a step taken against a serious breach of human rights today may, perhaps, thwart a genocide five years down the road. Terminating violence well before it erupts is** an **entirely different** ball game. Since there is no window to the future, **all interventions claiming to have halted a process heading towards genocide are mere speculations and will remain so unless one accepts that we live in deterministic**/predictable **world**. As long as the future remains a tabula rasa until it becomes the present, prevention amounts to little more than a serious guessing game. Who is prepared to say he/she saw genocide in the about to disintegrate Yugoslavia? **What were the concrete and indisputable symptoms of an impending crisis?** As far as the profession of genocide studies is concerned, primary emphasis should be on research of actual or near genocides and not on that which inherently - with few exceptions - is unknowable, no matter how sophisticated the methodology of prediction. In a lecture on genocide prediction held at Yale four years ago, this writer concluded **there can be no common denominator for all genocides allowing for a common methodology of prediction. There are**, in other words, **no hard and fast early warning signals except for vague generalities that may and, more likely, may not lead to an escalation in the direction of genocide**. A primary purpose of Genocide Studies is, of course, the hope that policy makers will be assisted by the insights of researchers. But theirs is to be activists, the opposite mindset of disinterested scholarship. The two - research and public policy - must be carefully kept distinct. **Their blurring leads to scholar-activists, a slippery slope to polemics and the loss of credibility**. It is a position held by Genocide Research, a stance that clearly and unambiguously distinguishes it from other journals dealing with genocide but tempted to opening the door to partisan prescriptions.

### Adv 1

#### THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS SLOWS THE PACE OF RAPID BALANCE SHIFTS AT THE REGIONAL LEVEL. THIS SOLVES THE OUTBREAK AND ESCALATION OF CATASTROPHIC WAR\*\*

Alagappa in ‘8

[Muthiah, Distinguished Senior Fellow at East-West Center, “Nuclear Weapons and National Security”, in The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia, ed. M. Alagappa, 479-480//wyo-tjc]

Nuclear weapons cast a long shadow that informs in fundamental ways the strategic policies and behavior of major powers (all but one of which possess nuclear weapons), their allies, and those states facing existential threats. They induce caution and set boundaries to the strategic interaction of nuclear weapon states and condition the role and use of force in their interactions. The danger of escalation limits military options in a crisis between nuclear weapon states and shapes the purpose and manner in which military force is used. Although relevant only in a small number of situations, these include the most serious regional conflicts that could escalate to large—scale war. Nuclear weapons help prevent the outbreak of hostilities, keep hostilities limited when they do break out, and prevent their escalation to major wars. Nuclear weapons enable weaker powers to deter stronger adversaries and help ameliorate the effects of imbalance in conventional military capability. By providing insurance to cope with unanticipated contingencies, they reduce immediate anxieties over military imbalances and vulnerabilities. Nuclear weapons enable major powers to take a long view of the strategic environment, set a moderate pace for their force development, and focus on other national priorities, including mutually beneficial interaction with other nuclear weapon states. Although nuclear weapons by themselves do not confer major power status, they are an important ingredient of power for countries that conduct themselves in a responsible manner and are experiencing rapid growth in other dimensions of power.

#### DETERRENCE/PROLIF DECREASES CONVENTIONAL ARMS RACING THAT CAUSES DESTRUCTIVE WARS.

Waltz in ‘3

[Kenneth N., Genius & Adjunct Professor, Columbia University, Professor Emeritus, UC-Berkeley, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, with Scott D. Sagan, p.153.

In the conclusion I make three points. They reinforce what I have said earlier and add a little to it. First, we can play King Canute if we wish to, but like him, we will be unable to hold the (nuclear) tides at bay. Nuclear weapons have spread slowly; conventional weapons have proliferated, and their destructiveness has grown alarmingly. Nuclear weapons are relatively cheap, and they work against the outbreak of major wars. For some countries, the alternative to nuclear weapons is to run ever-more expensive conventional arms races, with increased risk of fighting highly destructive wars.

#### Conventional war is a unique opportunity for disease spread

Singer 2

Peter W., Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution: Director of the 21st Century Defense Initiative, PhD in Government Harvard University, Department of Defense-Balkans Task Force, “AIDS and International Security”, Spring 2002, Survival Vol. 44, No. 1, Spring 2002, Pg. 145-148, [www.brookings.edu/dybdocroot/views/articles/fellows/2002\_singer.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/dybdocroot/views/articles/fellows/2002_singer.pdf).

Besides more soldiers dying from war’s accessories, these forces typically leave a swath of disease in their path. The original spread of infection in East Africa can actually be traced back to the axes of advance used by individual units in the Tanzanian army.52 At the same time, the presence of war hinders efforts at countering the disease’s spread, further heightening the impact of both. In Sierra Leone and the DRC, for example, all efforts at AIDS prevention were put on hold by the breakdown of order during the wars.53 The added harm of war is that valuable windows of opportunity, in nipping diseases before they reach critical stages, are lost.

#### Extinction – don’t endorse the gendered language

Fox 97

C. William. Lieutenant COLONEL. 6/24/97. <http://se1.isn.ch/serviceengine/FileContent?serviceID=ISN&fileid=4341F68C-1AF1-FEB7-10D7-5EE127216D05&lng=en>.

HIV is a pandemic killer without a cure, and viruses such as Ebola-Zaire are merely a plane ride away from the population centers of the developed world. Viruses like ebola, which are endemic to Africa, have the potential to inflict morbidity and mortality on a scale not seen in the world since the Black Plague epidemics of medieval Europe (which killed a full quarter of Europe's population in the 13th and 14th centuries.)18 These diseases are not merely African problems, they present a real threat to mankind. They should be taken every bit as seriously as the concern for deliberate use of weapons of mass destruction.

#### PROLIF SOLVES INEVITABLE MISCALCULATIONS AND ESCALATION AND NEW NUCLEAR STATES WILL FIT INTO A DETERRENCE WORLD ORDER AND PREVENT THE OUTBREAK OF MAJOR WARS

Waltz in ‘3

[Kenneth N., Genius & Adjunct Professor, Columbia University, Professor Emeritus, UC-Berkeley, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, with Scott D. Sagan, p.43-45.

What will a world populated by a few more nuclear states look like? I have drawn a picture of such a world that accords with experience throughout the nuclear age. Those who dread a world with more nuclear states do little more than assert that more is worse and claim without substantiation that new nuclear states will be less responsible and less capable of self control than the old ones have been. They feel fears that many felt when they imagined how a nuclear China would behave. Such fears have proved unfounded as nuclear weapons have slowly spread. I have found many reasons for believing that with more nuclear states the world will have a promising future. I have reached this unusual conclusion for three main reasons. First, international politics is a self-help system, and in such systems the principal parties determine their own fate, the fate of other parties, and the fate of the system. This will continue to be so. Second, nuclear weaponry makes miscalculation difficult because it is hard not to be aware of how much damage a small number of warheads can do. Early in this century Norman Angell argued that war would not occur because it could not pay. But conventional wars have brought political gains to some countries at the expense of others. Among nuclear countries, possible losses in war overwhelm possible gains. In the nuclear age Angell's dictum becomes persuasive. When the active use of force threatens to bring great losses, war becomes less likely. This proposition is widely accepted but insufficiently emphasized. Nuclear weapons reduced the chances of war between the United States and the Soviet Union and between the Soviet Union and China. One must expect them to have similar effects elsewhere. Where nuclear weapons threaten to make the cost of wars immense, who will dare to start them? Third, new nuclear states will feel the constraints that present nuclear states have experienced. New nuclear states will be more concerned for their safety and more mindful of dangers than some of the old ones have been. Until recently, only the great and some of the major powers have had nuclear weapons. While nuclear weapons have spread slowly, con- [\*45//wyo-tjc] ventional weapons have proliferated. Under these circumstances, wars have been fought not at the center but at the periphery of international politics. The likelihood of war decreases as deterrent and defensive capabilities increase. Nuclear weapons make wars hard to start. These statements hold for small as for big nuclear powers. Because they do, the gradual spread of nuclear weapons is more to be welcomed than feared.

#### EVEN THE MOST RADICALLY DRIVEN NETWORKS THAT EMPLOY SUICIDE TACTICS ARE DETERRABLE

Quinlan in ‘6

[Michael, Former Undersecretary of State for Defence, “Deterrence and Deterrability”, in Deterrence and the New Global Security Environment, ed Kenyon & Simpson, P. 7-8//wyo-tjc]

There is naturally now, in the wake of 11 September, a further strand of concern about the willingness (increasingly evident also in the Israeli/Palestinian context) of individuals to give their lives — give them, not merely risk them — in order to early out terrorist attacks. What can deterrence, in the strict sense, do about these? In immediate terms, nothing. But they scarcely ever, if indeed ever, exist and operate in isolation from organisations, and these organisations rarely in isolation from states: and deterrence can be brought to hear by that route. We should, moreover, not write off entirely the idea of achieving something. in the long term, rather more directly. These individuals, whether regarded as tragic or awful, are not simply insane; they have their value-systems. They prize the respect of their families, their communities and their co—religionists: they often cherish the hope of a hereafter. The expectation of changing any of this may be distant and uncertain, and change cannot be imposed from outside the communities, especially if within them there is, as in the Middle East. a profound and shared sense of beleaguered grievance. But this dimension should not be abandoned. Islam — it is fair to focus there, because as a matter of plain fact the phenomenon of suicidal immolation is to he found above all in that environment — is a religion of moral teaching, and that teaching (at least in most of its explicit and established forms) does not commend acts like that of 11 September. If that be so, it is legitimate to wonder whether disapproval might come to be voiced more trenchantly and mobilized more effectively. That could make a genuine contribution to deterrence, through converting the reactions of families, friends and peers into costs rather than rewards. It would need, as a practical matter, to he partnered by a more resolute tackling of perceived grievance; and one must recognize the human difficulty often faced by moral teachers within settings where historic resentment is deeply ingrained. (It may be suspected — to invoke a parallel close to the writer personally — that in at least the initial stages of the Northern Ireland ‘troubles’ of the later twentieth century the Roman Catholic clergy there were not all as immediate, as outspoken, as unequivocal and as unanimous in their condemnation of Republican terrorism as Christian ethics truly required and as they themselves mostly later became: but significant change did take place, and progressively played a part in making community attitudes less tolerant of terrorism.) In brief, this is a relevant dimension of the terrorist problem; and there are opportunities and responsibilities capable of being exercised.

#### TERRORIST ACQUISITION IS SO UNLIKELY AS TO BE A FICTION—STATES WOULD NEVER TRANSFER WEAPONS AND STEALING THEM IS EVEN MORE DIFFICULT

Kapur in ‘8

[S. Paul, Associate Professor of Strategic Research at United States Naval War College, “Nuclear Terrorism: Prospects in Asia”, in The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia, ed. M. Alagappa, p. 324-325//wyo-tjc]

If a terrorist group’s goal can be advanced by the use of nuclear weapons, it would still need to meet a second important requirement: it would need to acquire a nuclear capability in the first place. It could do so either by procuring an intact weapon or by producing one. Terrorists could procure an intact weapon in two different ways. First, a nuclear state could voluntarily transfer a weapon to terrorists for use against a designated enemy. This could enable the state to inflict massive damage on the enemy while maintaining deniability and potentially avoiding retaliation (Ferguson and Potter 2004: 55—57). This occurrence, however, is unlikely. In this “transfer” scenario, the nuclear state would lose control of the weapon in question, forcing it to place enormous trust in the terrorists’ loyalty and judgment. It is doubtful that a nuclear state’s leaders would be willing to trust a terrorist organization to this degree (Feiguson and Pottei 2004 57 Glaser and Fetter 2001) Terrorist groups could also acquire an intact weapon by stealing it from a nuclear state This would be an extremely difficult feat even for sophisticated terrorist groups. Nuclear weapons are protected by the most robust security measures that nation—states can devise. Protective measures include programs to ensure the reliability of the personnel in charge of weapons extensive physical barriers including location in heavily guarded, often isolated military bases; electronic systems to prevent unauthorized weapons use; and storage of the fissile core separate from the rest of the weapon. According to Ferguson and Potter, in the absence of significant insider assistance, theft of a nuclear weapon by terrorists is probably better described as “the stuff of fiction than a practicable approach for a terrorist organization.” Even in the event of inside help or major political unrest within a nuclear weapon state, terrorist theft of an intact nuclear device would be difficult and unlikely (Bunn, Holdren, and Wier 2002: 5; Ferguson and Potter 2004: 57—65,119).